arXiv:0912.1963v1 [math.AC] 10 Dec 2009

ARITHMETICAL RANK OF COHEN–MACAULAY SQUAREFREE MONOMIAL IDEALS OF HEIGHT TWO

KYOUKO KIMURA

Abstract. In this paper, we prove that a squarefree monomial ideal of height 2 whose quotient ring is Cohen–Macaulay is set-theoretic complete intersection.

1. Introduction

Let R be a polynomial ring over a field K. Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of R and $G(I)$ the minimal set of monomial generators of I. The *arithmetical rank* of I is defined by the minimum number r of elements $a_1, \ldots, a_r \in R$ such that

$$\sqrt{(a_1, \ldots, a_r)} = \sqrt{I}. \tag{1.1}$$

We denote it by $\operatorname{ara} I$. When (1.1) holds, we say that $a_1, \ldots, a_r$ *generate* I *up to radical*. By Krull's principal ideal theorem, we have $\operatorname{height} I \leq \operatorname{ara} I$. When the equality holds, we say that I is *set-theoretic complete intersection*. Moreover, Lyubeznik [14] proved that for a squarefree monomial ideal I, the projective dimension of R/I over R, denoted by $\operatorname{pd}_R R/I$ (or $\operatorname{pd} R/I$ if there is no confusion), provides a better lower bound of the arithmetical rank of I. Many authors involving Barile [1, 2, 3, 4], Barile and Terai [5, 6], Ene, Olteanu and Terai [10], Kummini [13], Schmitt and Vogel [16], Terai and Yoshida with the author [11, 12], investigated when $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I$ holds.

In this paper, we prove the following theorem:

Theorem 1.1 (See Theorem 4.1)**.** *Let* I *be a squarefree monomial ideal of* R *of height* 2*. Suppose that* R/I *is Cohen–Macaulay. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = 2.$$

In particular, I *is set-theoretic complete intersection.*

That is, ideals as in Theorem 1.1 are generated by 2 elements up to radical. Note that the equality $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I$ does not always hold for Cohen–Macaulay squarefree monomial ideals I of height 3 (when $\operatorname{char} K \neq 2$) as founded by Yan [18], Terai and Yoshida with the author [12].

We explain the organization of this paper. First in Section 2, we state the motivated problem of this paper (Problem 2.1), which corresponds to Alexander dual of the results in Barile and Terai [5]. Partial answers for this problem are given in Section 3 (Propositions 3.1 and 3.2). In particular, Proposition 3.2 plays the key role on the proof of Theorem 1.1, which is given in Section 4.

Date: December 10, 2009.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13F55; Secondary 13A15, 13H10.

Key words and phrases. arithmetical rank, Cohen–Macaulay, set-theoretic complete intersection, Alexander duality, cone.

The main result of Barile and Terai [5, Theorem 1], which is our motivated paper, required the assumption that K is algebraically closed. At the last of this paper, in Section 5, we give an improvement proof of that result. Consequently, we can remove the assumption on K.

2. Preliminaries and the motivated problem

In this section, we state the motivated problem of this paper. As before, we recall some definitions and properties of simplicial complexes and Stanley–Reisner ideals, especially, Alexander duality. For more detail, we refer to [7, Section 5], [17].

Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of a polynomial ring R over a field K. The *graded Betti number* of R/I is defined by $\beta_{i,j}(R/I) = \dim_K [\mathrm{Tor}_i^R(R/I, K)]_j$. The *initial degree*, the (*Castelnuovo–Mumford*) *regularity* of I are defined by

$$\operatorname{indeg} I = \min\{j \ : \ \beta_{1,j}(R/I) \neq 0\}, \quad \operatorname{reg} I = \max\{j - i + 1 \ : \ \beta_{i,j}(R/I) \neq 0\},$$

respectively. In general, the inequality $\operatorname{reg} I \geq \operatorname{indeg} I$ holds. When $\operatorname{reg} I = \operatorname{indeg} I = k$, we say that I has a *k-linear resolution.*

Let $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$ be a set of indeterminates over a field K. A *simplicial complex* Δ on the vertex set X is a collection of subsets of X with the properties (i) $\{x_i\} \in \Delta$ for all $x_i \in X$; (ii) $F \in \Delta$ and $G \subset F$ imply $G \in \Delta$. If Δ consists of all subsets of X, then Δ is called a *simplex.* An element of Δ is called a *face* of Δ. A maximal face of Δ with respect to inclusion is called a *facet* of Δ. The *dimension* of Δ is defined by $\dim \Delta = \max\{|F| - 1 : F \in \Delta\}$, where $|F|$ denotes the cardinality of F. The *Alexander dual complex* Δ^* is defined by $\Delta^* = \{F \subset X : X \setminus F \notin \Delta\}$, which is also a simplicial complex. If $\dim \Delta < n - 2$, then the vertex set of Δ^* coincides with X. When this is the case, $\Delta^{**} = \Delta$.

For a simplicial complex Δ on the vertex set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, we associate a squarefree monomial ideal I_Δ of $K[X] = K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ as follows:

$$I_\Delta = \bigl(x_{i_1} \cdots x_{i_s} \ : \ 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq n, \ \{x_{i_1}, \ldots, x_{i_s}\} \notin \Delta\bigr),$$

which is called the *Stanley–Reisner ideal* of Δ. The quotient ring $K[\Delta] = K[X]/I_\Delta$ is called the *Stanley–Reisner ring* of Δ. The minimal prime decomposition of I_Δ is given by

$$I_\Delta = \bigcap_{F \in \Delta \ : \ \text{facet}} P_F, \tag{2.1}$$

where $P_F = (x_i : x_i \in X \setminus F)$.

On the other hand, it is well-known that for a squarefree monomial ideal I of $R = K[X]$ with $\operatorname{indeg} I \geq 2$, there exists a simplicial complex Δ on X such that $I = I_\Delta$. Assume that $\operatorname{height} I \geq 2$. Then since $\dim \Delta < n - 2$, we can consider the ideal $I^* = I_{\Delta^*}$ of R, which is called the *Alexander dual ideal* of $I = I_\Delta$. Since $\Delta^{**} = \Delta$, we have $I^{**} = I$. The minimal set of monomial generators of $I^* = I_{\Delta^*}$ is given by

$$G(I^*) = G(I_{\Delta^*}) = \{m_{X \setminus F} \ : \ F \in \Delta \text{ is a facet of } \Delta\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where $m_{X \setminus F} = \prod_{x_i \in X \setminus F} x_i$. Then it is easy to see that $\operatorname{indeg} I^* = \operatorname{height} I$ by (2.1), (2.2). Moreover, Eagon and Reiner [9, Theorem 3] proved that I has a linear resolution if and only if R/I^* is Cohen–Macaulay.

Now we state our motivated problem.

Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$. Let x_0 be a new indeterminate and F a face of Δ. A *cone from* x_0 *over* F, denoted by $\operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$, is the simplex on the vertex set $F \cup \{x_0\}$. Then $\Delta' := \Delta \cup \operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$ is a simplicial complex on the vertex set $X' := X \cup \{x_0\}$. Barile and Terai [5] investigated some relations between arithmetical ranks of I_Δ and $I_{\Delta'}$ ([5, Theorem 1]). Moreover, they proved that if $\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta]$ holds, then $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta']$ also holds ([5, Theorem 2]). As its corollary, they proved that if a squarefree monomial ideal $I \subset R$ has a 2-linear resolution, then $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I$ holds. (This result was first proved by Morales [15] on the different way.)

We consider the following problem which corresponding to Alexander dual of their results:

Problem 2.1. *Let* Δ *be a simplicial complex on the vertex set* $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$ *with* $\dim \Delta < n - 2$. *Let* F *be an arbitrary face of* Δ^* *and* x_0 *a new vertex. Set* $X' = X \cup \{x_0\}$, $\Gamma = \Delta^*$, $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$, *and* $\Delta' = (\Gamma')^*$.

Are there any relations between arithmetical ranks of I_Δ *and* $I_{\Delta'}$*? In particular, if* $\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta]$ *holds, then does* $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta']$ *hold?*

Here, we compare the projective dimension of $K[\Delta']$ with that of $K[\Delta]$.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* Δ *and* Δ' *be simplicial complexes as in Problem 2.1. Then*

$$\operatorname{pd} K[\Delta'] = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta].$$

Proof. Set $R = K[X]$, $R' = K[X']$, $I = I_\Delta$, $I' = I_{\Delta'}$, and $G(I) = \{m_1, \dots, m_\mu\}$. Then

$$I_\Gamma = I^* = P_{G_1} \cap \cdots \cap P_{G_\mu} \subset R,$$

where $G_1, \dots, G_\mu$ are all facets of $\Gamma = \Delta^*$ and $m_j = \prod_{x_i \in P_{G_j}} x_i$. We may assume $F \subset G_1$ without loss of the generality. Then

$$I_{\Gamma'} = P_{F \cup \{x_0\}} \cap (P_{G_1} R' + (x_0)) \cap \cdots \cap (P_{G_\mu} R' + (x_0)) \subset R'.$$

Hence

$$I' = (m_0, x_0 m_1, \dots, x_0 m_\mu) R' = m_0 R' + x_0 I R',$$

where $m_0 = \prod_{x_i \in P_{F \cup \{x_0\}}} x_i$. Note that m_0 is divisible by m_1 since $P_{G_1} R' \subset P_{F \cup \{x_0\}}$.

Let us consider the short exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow R'/m_0 R' \cap x_0 I R' \longrightarrow R'/m_0 R' \oplus R'/x_0 I R' \longrightarrow R'/I' \longrightarrow 0. \tag{2.3}$$

Note that $m_0 R' \cap x_0 I R' = x_0 m_0 R'$. Since $\operatorname{pd}_{R'} R'/I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I \geq \operatorname{height} I \geq 2$, $\operatorname{pd}_{R'} R'/x_0 m_0 R' = \operatorname{pd}_{R'} R'/m_0 R' = 1$, the long exact sequence obtained by applying $\operatorname{Tor}^{R'}(-, K)$ to (2.3) yields

$$\operatorname{pd} K[\Delta'] = \operatorname{pd}_{R'} R'/I' = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta],$$

as desired. $\square$

3. Partial answers for Problem 2.1

In this section, we give partial answers for Problem 2.1. Throughout of this section, we use the notations as in Problem 2.1.

First, we show a relation between arithmetical ranks of I_Δ and $I_{\Delta'}$.

Proposition 3.1. *Let Δ and Δ' be simplicial complexes as in Problem 2.1. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq \operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta} + 1.$$

In particular, if $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta]$ *holds, then* $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'}$ *coincides with either* $\operatorname{pd} K[\Delta']$ *or* $\operatorname{pd} K[\Delta'] + 1$.

Proof. Set $R = K[X]$, $R' = K[X']$, $I = I_{\Delta}$, $I' = I_{\Delta'}$, and $G(I) = \{m_1, \dots, m_\mu\}$. Then

$$I' = (m_0, x_0 m_1, \dots, x_0 m_\mu)R',$$

where $m_0 = \prod_{x_i \in P_{F \cup \{x_0\}}} x_i$.

Put $h = \operatorname{ara} I$ and let $q_1, \dots, q_h$ be elements of R which generate I up to radical. Then $x_0 q_1, \dots, x_0 q_h$ generate $(x_0 m_1, \dots, x_0 m_\mu)$ up to radical. This implies that $m_0, x_0 q_1, \dots, x_0 q_h$ generate I' up to radical. Therefore we have $\operatorname{ara} I' \leq h + 1$.

Then the latter claim immediately follows from Lemma 2.2 and the inequality $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \geq \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta']$. □

Next, we give a partial answer for the second question of Problem 2.1.

Proposition 3.2. *Let Δ and Δ' be simplicial complexes as in Problem 2.1. Suppose that* $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta] = 2$. *Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta'] = 2.$$

In the study of the arithmetical rank, the technique based on linear algebraic consideration has been developed by Barile [2], Barile and Terai [5] (see also [6]). Our proof of this proposition also goes along this current.

Proof. By Lemma 2.2, we have $\operatorname{pd} K[\Delta'] = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta] = 2$. Therefore it suffices to prove that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq 2$.

Set $R = K[X]$, $R' = K[X']$, $I = I_{\Delta}$, $I' = I_{\Delta'}$, and $G(I) = \{m_1, \dots, m_\mu\}$. Then

$$I' = (m_0, x_0 m_1, \dots, x_0 m_\mu)R',$$

where $m_0 = \prod_{x_i \in P_{F \cup \{x_0\}}} x_i$. Let G be a facet of $\Gamma = \Delta^*$ containing F. We may assume $m_1 = \prod_{x_i \in P_G} x_i$. Then m_0 is divisible by m_1 since $P_G R' \subset P_{F \cup \{x_0\}}$.

Let q_1, q_2 be elements of R which generate I up to radical. Note that $q_1, q_2 \in I$ because I is a squarefree monomial ideal. By $m_i \in \sqrt{(q_1, q_2)}$, there exists some integer $\ell_i \geq 1$ such that $m_i^{\ell_i} \in (q_1, q_2)$. Then we can write

$$m_i^{\ell_i} = a_{i1} q_1 + a_{i2} q_2, \quad i = 1, \dots, \mu,$$

where $a_{i1}, a_{i2} \in R$. Set $A = (a_{ij})_{i=1,\dots,\mu; j=1,2}$. Then

$$\begin{pmatrix} m_1^{\ell_1} \\ \vdots \\ m_\mu^{\ell_\mu} \end{pmatrix} = A \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set

$$J' = (x_0 q_1 - a_{12} m_0, x_0 q_2 + a_{11} m_0)R'.$$

We prove $\sqrt{J'} = I'$. Since $x_0 q_1 - a_{12} m_0, x_0 q_2 + a_{11} m_0 \in I'$, we have $\sqrt{J'} \subset I'$. We prove the opposite inclusion.

Since

$$A\begin{pmatrix} x_0q_1 - a_{12}m_0 \\ x_0q_2 + a_{11}m_0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_0m_1^{\ell_1} + f_1m_0 \\ \vdots \\ x_0m_\mu^{\ell_\mu} + f_\mu m_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{where} \quad f_i = a_{11}a_{i2} - a_{12}a_{i1},$$

we have $x_0m_i^{\ell_i} + f_im_0 \in J'$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \mu$. Note that $f_1 = a_{11}a_{12} - a_{12}a_{11} = 0$. Thus $x_0m_1^{\ell_1} \in J'$, that is, $x_0m_1 \in \sqrt{J'}$. Since m_1 divides m_0, multiplying $x_0m_i^{\ell_i} + f_im_0 \in J'$ by x_0 implies $x_0^2m_i^{\ell_i} \in \sqrt{J'}$, that is, $x_0m_i \in \sqrt{J'}$.

Here, recall that $q_1, q_2 \in I = (m_1, \ldots, m_\mu)$. Thus $x_0q_1, x_0q_2 \in \sqrt{J'}$. Consequently, we have $a_{11}m_0, a_{12}m_0 \in \sqrt{J'}$. By $m_1^{\ell_1} = a_{11}q_1 + a_{12}q_2$, we have

$$m_0m_1^{\ell_1} = m_0(a_{11}q_1 + a_{12}q_2) = (a_{11}m_0)q_1 + (a_{12}m_0)q_2 \in \sqrt{J'}.$$

This implies $m_0 \in \sqrt{J'}$ since m_0 is divisible by m_1. Therefore $\sqrt{J'} \supset I'$ holds, as required. □

Example 3.3. Let Δ be the simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ whose facets are $\{x_1, x_3\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{x_2, x_4\}$. Then

$$I = I_\Delta = (x_2, x_4) \cap (x_1, x_4) \cap (x_1, x_3) = (x_1x_2, x_1x_4, x_3x_4).$$

The Alexander dual complex Γ of Δ has facets $\{x_3, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{x_1, x_2\}$, that is, Γ is a line segment with 4 vertices. Take the face $F = \{x_4\} \in \Gamma$ and a new vertex $x_5 := x_0$. Then $\Gamma' = \Gamma \cup \mathrm{co}_{x_5}\{x_4\}$ is a line segment with 5 vertices and

$$I_{\Gamma'} = (x_1, x_2, x_3) \cap (x_1, x_2, x_5) \cap (x_1, x_4, x_5) \cap (x_3, x_4, x_5).$$

Thus $I' = I_{(\Gamma')^*}$ is generated by

$$x_1x_2x_3, \; x_1x_2x_5, \; x_1x_4x_5, \; x_3x_4x_5.$$

In this case, $m_0 = x_1x_2x_3$ and $m_1 = x_1x_2$. By the result of Schmitt and Vogel [16, Lemma, p. 249], it is easy to see that the following two elements q_1, q_2 generate I up to radical:

$$q_1 = x_1x_4, \qquad q_2 = x_1x_2 + x_3x_4.$$

Then

$$m_1^2 = -x_2x_3q_1 + x_1x_2q_2. \tag{3.1}$$

By Proposition 3.2, the following two elements q_1', q_2' generate I' up to radical:

$$\begin{aligned} q_1' &= x_5q_1 - x_1x_2m_0 = x_1x_4x_5 - x_1^2x_2^2x_3, \\ q_2' &= x_5q_2 - x_2x_3m_0 = x_1x_2x_5 + x_3x_4x_5 - x_1x_2^2x_3^2. \end{aligned}$$

4. Proof of the main theorem

In this section, we prove the following theorem, which is the main result in this paper.

Theorem 4.1. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal of $R = K[X]$ of height 2. Suppose that R/I is Cohen–Macaulay. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = \operatorname{height} I = 2.$$

In particular, I is set-theoretic complete intersection.

The Alexander dual of ideals satisfying the assumptions of this theorem have a 2-linear resolution. To study these ideals, we recall the definition of the generalized tree.

We say that a simplicial complex is a *generalized tree* if it can be obtained by the following recursive procedure: (i) a simplex is a generalized tree; (ii) if Δ is a generalized tree, then $\Delta \cup \operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$ is also a generalized tree for any $F \in \Delta$ and for any new vertex x_0. Then a Stanley–Reisner ideal I_Δ which has a 2-linear resolution is characterized as the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2 (See Barile and Terai [5, Lemma 2])**.** *Let Δ be a simplicial complex which is not a simplex. Then I_Δ has a 2-linear resolution if and only if Δ is a generalized tree.*

Now we prove Theorem 4.1. The proof is done as an application of Proposition 3.2.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Since R/I is Cohen–Macaulay, we have $\operatorname{pd}_R R/I = \operatorname{height} I = 2$. First, we note that when $\mu(I) \leq \operatorname{pd}_R R/I + 1$, it is known that $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I$ holds; see e.g., [11, Theorem 2.1]. Thus in our situation, $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = 2$ holds if $\mu(I) \leq 3$.

If $\operatorname{indeg} I = 1$, then I is of the form (x_1, m_2) by the assumptions of I. In this case, $\operatorname{ara} I = 2$ trivially holds.

Assume that $\operatorname{indeg} I \geq 2$. We proceed the proof by induction on the number $|X|$ of variables. The minimum number $|X|$ in which there exists an ideal I satisfying our assumption is 3 and such an ideal is of the form

$$I = (x_1, x_2) \cap (x_1, x_3) \cap (x_2, x_3) = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3, x_2x_3).$$

Then since $\mu(I) = 3$, we have $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = 2$.

Now assume $|X| > 3$. Since $I^* = I_\Gamma$ has a 2-linear resolution, Γ is a generalized tree by Lemma 4.2, and there exist a vertex $x \in X$, a generalized tree $\overline{\Gamma}$ on the vertex set $X \setminus \{x\}$ and a face $F \in \overline{\Gamma}$ such that $\Gamma = \overline{\Gamma} \cup \operatorname{co}_x F$ by the definition of the generalized tree. Note that $\overline{\Gamma}$ is not a simplex because $\operatorname{height} I_\Gamma = \operatorname{indeg} I \geq 2$. Then $\overline{J} := I_{\overline{\Gamma}}$ has a 2-linear resolution.

If $\operatorname{height} \overline{J} = 1$, then $\overline{J}$ is of the form $(x_1) \cap P_2$, and I^* is of the form

$$I^* = I_\Gamma = P_{F \cup \{x\}} \cap (x_1, x) \cap (P_2R + (x)).$$

Therefore $\mu(I) \leq 3$.

Thus we may assume $\operatorname{height} \overline{J} \geq 2$. Then $\overline{I} := (\overline{J})^*$ satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.1. By the induction hypothesis, we have $\operatorname{ara} \overline{I} = \operatorname{pd}_R R/\overline{I} = 2$. Hence, we have $\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I = 2$ by Proposition 3.2. □

The next example, which is a generalization of Example 3.3, gives an example of ideals which satisfy the assumptions of Theorem 4.1.

Example 4.3. Let us consider the squarefree monomial ideal I_n of $K[x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n]$ ($n \geq 4$) generated by the following $n - 1$ elements:

$$m_i^{(n)} = \frac{x_1 \cdots x_n}{x_{n-i}x_{n-i+1}}, \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1.$$

That is, I_n is the Alexander dual ideal of the Stanley–Reisner ideal I_{Γ_n}, where Γ_n is the simplicial complex whose facets are $\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \ldots, \{x_{n-1}, x_n\}$. The ideals I, I' in Example 3.3 are I_4, I_5, respectively.

Then the height of I_n is equal to 2, and the quotient ring is Cohen–Macaulay. Therefore by Theorem 4.1, we have $\operatorname{ara} I_n = 2$.

For $n = 4, 5$, two elements $q_1^{(n)}, q_2^{(n)}$ which generate I_n up to radical are given in Example 3.3, i.e.,

$$\begin{cases} q_1^{(4)} = m_2^{(4)}, \\ q_2^{(4)} = m_1^{(4)} + m_3^{(4)}, \end{cases} \qquad \begin{cases} q_1^{(5)} = x_5 q_1^{(4)} - x_1 x_2 m_1^{(5)}, \\ q_2^{(5)} = x_5 q_2^{(4)} - x_2 x_3 m_1^{(5)}. \end{cases}$$

In general, two elements $q_1^{(n)}, q_2^{(n)}$ which generate I_n up to radical are given by the following recursive formula:

$$\begin{cases} q_1^{(n+1)} = x_{n+1} q_1^{(n)} - x_{n-2}^{n-3} q_1^{(n-1)} m_1^{(n+1)}, \\ q_2^{(n+1)} = x_{n+1} q_2^{(n)} - x_{n-2}^{n-3} q_2^{(n-1)} m_1^{(n+1)}, \end{cases} \qquad n \geq 5. \tag{4.1}$$

We prove this by induction on n. Note that $I'_n = I_{n+1}$ with $F = \{x_n\} (\subset G = \{x_{n-1}, x_n\})$ and $x_0 = x_{n+1}$ with respect to the notations of the proof of Proposition 3.2. Hence by the proof of Proposition 3.2, it suffices to check the following equality by induction on n under the hypothesis that $q_1^{(n)}, q_2^{(n)}$ generate I_n up to radical:

$$(m_1^{(n)})^{n-2} = -x_{n-2}^{n-3} q_2^{(n-1)} q_1^{(n)} + x_{n-2}^{n-3} q_1^{(n-1)} q_2^{(n)}, \qquad n \geq 5. \tag{4.2}$$

When $n = 5$, since

$$\begin{aligned} -q_2^{(4)} q_1^{(5)} + q_1^{(4)} q_2^{(5)} &= -q_2^{(4)} (x_5 q_1^{(4)} - x_1 x_2 m_1^{(5)}) + q_1^{(4)} (x_5 q_2^{(4)} - x_2 x_3 m_1^{(5)}) \\ &= (x_1 x_2 q_2^{(4)} - x_2 x_3 q_1^{(4)}) m_1^{(5)} \\ &= (m_1^{(4)})^2 m_1^{(5)} \quad \text{by (3.1)} \end{aligned}$$

and $x_3^2 (m_1^{(4)})^2 m_1^{(5)} = (m_1^{(5)})^3$, we have the desired equality. Similarly, for general n,

$$\begin{aligned} &- q_2^{(n-1)} q_1^{(n)} + q_1^{(n-1)} q_2^{(n)} \\ =&- q_2^{(n-1)} (x_n q_1^{(n-1)} - x_{n-3}^{n-4} q_1^{(n-2)} m_1^{(n)}) + q_1^{(n-1)} (x_n q_2^{(n-1)} - x_{n-3}^{n-4} q_2^{(n-2)} m_1^{(n)}) \\ =&(x_{n-3}^{n-4} q_1^{(n-2)} q_2^{(n-1)} - x_{n-3}^{n-4} q_2^{(n-2)} q_1^{(n-1)}) m_1^{(n)} \\ =&(m_1^{(n-1)})^{n-3} m_1^{(n)} \quad \text{by induction hypothesis} \end{aligned}$$

and $x_{n-2}^{n-3} (m_1^{(n-1)})^{n-3} m_1^{(n)} = (m_1^{(n)})^{n-2}$ yield the equation (4.2).

Another class of ideals which satisfies the assumptions of Theorem 4.1 is found in Barile [1, Section 3]. It is essentially Alexander dual of the class of Ferrers ideals (see [8], [4]). In [1], Barile construct 2 elements which generate the ideals up to radical on the different way.

5. Improvement proof of the result by Barile and Terai

Let Δ be a simplicial complex on the vertex set X. Let F be a face of Δ and x_0 new vertex. Set $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \operatorname{co}_{x_0} F$. Throughout of this section, we use these notations. Note that these are different from those of previous sections.

In our motivated paper Barile and Terai [5], the main result [5, Theorem 1] depends on the base field K. Precisely, it needs the assumption that K is algebraically closed. In this section, we give an improved proof of it which does not depend on the base field K.

Theorem 5.1 (cf. Barile and Terai [5, Theorem 1])**.** *Let* Δ *be a simplicial complex on the vertex set* $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$*,* F *a face of* Δ*, and* x_0 *new vertex. Set* $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \mathrm{co}_{x_0} F$*. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq \max\{\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta + 1, n - |F|\}.$$

As a consequence of our improvement, we can also omit the assumption on K for other results in [5]:

Theorem 5.2 (cf. Barile and Terai [5, Theorem 2])**.** *Let* Δ *be a simplicial complex on the vertex set* $X = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$*,* F *a face of* Δ*, and* x_0 *new vertex. Set* $\Delta' = \Delta \cup \mathrm{co}_{x_0} F$*. If* $\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta]$ *holds, then* $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} = \operatorname{pd} K[\Delta']$ *also holds.*

Corollary 5.3 (cf. Barile and Terai [5, Corollary 3])**.** *Let* I *be a squarefree monomial ideal of* $R = K[X]$*. Suppose that* I *has a* 2*-linear resolution. Then*

$$\operatorname{ara} I = \operatorname{pd}_R R/I.$$

Corollary 5.3 was first proved by Morales [15, Theorems 8 and 9] on the different way, but he also assumed that K is algebraically closed.

Now, we prove Theorem 5.1. The proof is divided into two steps. We construct $\max\{\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta + 1, n - |F|\}$ elements which generate $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical in the latter step (Step 2). The former step (Step 1) is assigned to transform elements which generate I_Δ up to radical so that the elements constructed in (Step 2) belong to $I_{\Delta'}$.

In our proof, (Step 1) is the same as that by Barile and Terai (see also Barile [2, Theorem 1]). Thus we omit the detail. Our improvement is in (Step 2). In Case 1 of (Step 2), the elements which generate $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical are the same as those of Barile and Terai. The difference is that we use the cofactor matrix instead of Cramer's Rule which they used, and we do not use Hilbert's Nullstellensatz. In Case 2 of (Step 2), we give the different elements which generate $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical from those of Barile and Terai. This is our main improvement.

Proof of Theorem 5.1. (*Step* 1) First, we fix the notation. Set $R = K[X]$ and $R' = K[X']$ where $X' = X \cup \{x_0\}$. If $F = X$, then $I_\Delta = I_{\Delta'} = 0$ and the assertion is trivially true. Thus we assume $F \neq X$. Let G be a facet of Δ which contains F. We can assume that $G = \{x_{s+1}, \dots, x_n\}$ and $F = \{x_{t+1}, \dots, x_n\}$, where $s \leq t$. Then $I_{\Delta'} = I_\Delta R' + (x_0x_1, \dots, x_0x_t)R'$. We set $\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = h$. Then we can rewrite the claim as

$$\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \leq \max\{h + 1, t\}.$$

Assume that $q_1, \dots, q_h$ generate I_Δ up to radical. Since $I_\Delta \subset P_G = (x_1, \dots, x_s)$ and $q_i \in I_\Delta$, we can write

$$q_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s} a_{ij} x_j, \qquad i = 1, 2, \dots, h,$$

where $a_{ij} \in R$. Then we can transform each q_i to

$$\overline{q}_i = \sum_{j=1}^{s} \overline{a}_{ij} x_j,$$

where $\overline{a}_{ij} \in I_\Delta$ preserving the property that $\overline{q}_1, \dots, \overline{q}_h$ generate I_Δ up to radical; see Barile and Terai [5, Proof of Theorem 1].

(*Step* 2) Now we find $\max\{h+1, t\}$ elements which generate $I_{\Delta'}$ up to radical. We divide into two cases.

Case 1: Suppose that $h+1 > t$.

We show that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \le h+1$. We set $\overline{A} = (\overline{a}_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,t}$, where $\overline{a}_{ij} = 0$ if $j > s$. Let $A_1 = \overline{A} + x_0 Id_t$, where Id_t denotes the $t \times t$ identity matrix. Set

$$J_1 = (\det A_1 - x_0^t, \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1, \dots, \overline{q}_t + x_0x_t, \overline{q}_{t+1}, \dots, \overline{q}_h)R'.$$

We prove $\sqrt{J_1} = I_{\Delta'}$. Since $\overline{a}_{ij} \in I_\Delta$, we have $\det A_1 - x_0^t \in I_\Delta R'$. Moreover since $\overline{q}_i \in I_\Delta$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, h$ and $x_0x_j \in I_{\Delta'}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$, we have $\sqrt{J_1} \subset I_{\Delta'}$. We prove the opposite inclusion. To do this, it suffices to show that $\overline{q}_i \in \sqrt{J_1}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$ and $x_0x_j \in \sqrt{J_1}$, $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$.

Let B_1 be the cofactor matrix of A_1. Then $B_1A_1 = (\det A_1)Id_t$. Since

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{q}_t + x_0x_t \end{pmatrix} = A_1 \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_t \end{pmatrix},$$

we have

$$B_1 \begin{pmatrix} \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{q}_t + x_0x_t \end{pmatrix} = B_1A_1 \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_t \end{pmatrix} = (\det A_1) \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_t \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $(\det A_1)x_j \in J_1$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$ by $\overline{q}_i + x_0x_i \in J_1$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$. Multiplying $\det A_1 - x_0^t \in J_1$ by x_j, we have $x_0^t x_j \in J_1$. Hence $x_0x_j \in \sqrt{J_1}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, t$. Since $\overline{q}_i + x_0x_i \in J_1$, we have $\overline{q}_i \in \sqrt{J_1}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, t$, as required.

Case 2: Suppose that $h+1 \le t$.

We show that $\operatorname{ara} I_{\Delta'} \le t$. Note that in this case, $s \le t-1$ because if $s = t$, then t is the height of the minimal prime P_G of I_Δ and Krull's principal ideal theorem shows that $\operatorname{ara} I \ge t$. This contradicts to $\operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = h \le t-1$.

We set $\overline{A}' = (\overline{a}_{ij})_{i,j=1,\dots,t-1}$, where $\overline{a}_{ij} = 0$ if $i > h$ or $j > s$. Let $A_2 = \overline{A}' + x_0 Id_{t-1}$, where Id_{t-1} denotes the $(t-1) \times (t-1)$ identity matrix. Set

$$J_2 = ((\det A_2)(x_0 + x_t) - x_0^t, \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1, \dots, \overline{q}_h + x_0x_h, x_0x_{h+1}, \dots, x_0x_{t-1})R'.$$

We prove $\sqrt{J_2} = I_{\Delta'}$. As $\overline{a}_{ij} \in I_\Delta$, similarly to Case 1, we have $\sqrt{J_2} \subset I_{\Delta'}$. We prove the opposite inclusion. Let B_2 be the cofactor matrix of A_2. Then $B_2A_2 = (\det A_2)Id_{t-1}$. Since we set $\overline{a}_{ij} = 0$ for $i > h$, we can write formally $x_0x_i = \overline{q}_i + x_0x_i$ for $i = h+1, \dots, t-1$. Using this notation, we have

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{q}_{t-1} + x_0x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} = A_2 \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus

$$B_2 \begin{pmatrix} \overline{q}_1 + x_0x_1 \\ \vdots \\ \overline{q}_{t-1} + x_0x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} = B_2A_2 \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix} = (\det A_2) \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_{t-1} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then $(\det A_2)x_j \in J_2$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$ by $\overline{q}_i + x_0x_i \in J_2$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$. Multiplying $(\det A_2)(x_0 + x_t) - x_0^t \in J_2$ by x_j, we have $x_0^t x_j \in J_2$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$. Hence $x_0x_j \in \sqrt{J_2}$ for $j = 1, 2, \dots, t-1$. Since $\overline{q}_i + x_0x_i \in J_2$, we have

$\overline{q}_i \in \sqrt{J_2}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, t-1$. In particular, $\overline{q}_i \in \sqrt{J_2}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, h$. Since $\sqrt{(\overline{q}_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_h)} = I_\Delta$ and $\overline{a}_{ij} \in I_\Delta$, we have

$$\overline{a}_{ij} \in \sqrt{(\overline{q}_1, \ldots, \overline{q}_h)} \subset \sqrt{J_2}, \qquad \text{for all } i, j.$$

Therefore $(\det A_2)(x_0 + x_t) - x_0^t \in J_2$ implies $x_0^{t-1}(x_0 + x_t) - x_0^t \in \sqrt{J_2}$. Thus we have $x_0^{t-1}x_t \in \sqrt{J_2}$, that is $x_0 x_t \in \sqrt{J_2}$. This completes the proof. $\square$

The next example was considered in Barile and Terai [5, Example 1] as the example to show elements given in the proof of [5, Theorem 1]. We show the elements given in our proof at the same example, too.

Example 5.4. Let Δ be the simplicial complex on the vertex set $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4\}$ whose facets are $\{x_1, x_2\}, \{x_1, x_4\}, \{x_2, x_3\}, \{x_3, x_4\}$. Then

$$I_\Delta = (x_1, x_2) \cap (x_1, x_4) \cap (x_2, x_3) \cap (x_3, x_4) = (x_1x_3, x_2x_4).$$

Thus I_Δ is complete intersection. In particular, $h = \operatorname{ara} I_\Delta = 2$. Set $q_1 = x_1x_3$ and $q_2 = x_2x_4$. Take the face $F = \{x_4\} \in \Delta$ and let x_0 be a new vertex. Then $I_{\Delta'}$ is generated by the following 5 elements:

$$x_1x_3, x_2x_4, x_0x_1, x_0x_2, x_0x_3.$$

Then $t = 3$. We take the facet G as $\{x_3, x_4\}$. Then $P_G = (x_1, x_2)$. In this case, we have

$$\overline{q}_1 = x_1x_3^2 \cdot x_1, \qquad \overline{q}_2 = x_2x_4^2 \cdot x_2.$$

Since $h + 1 = 3 = t$, we apply the Case 2 of the proof of Theorem 5.1. Since

$$\overline{A}' = \begin{pmatrix} x_1x_3^2 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2x_4^2 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} x_1x_3^2 + x_0 & 0 \\ 0 & x_2x_4^2 + x_0 \end{pmatrix},$$

the ideal $I_{\Delta'}$ is generated by the following 3 elements up to radical:

$$\begin{aligned} &(x_1x_3^2 + x_0)(x_2x_4^2 + x_0)(x_0 + x_3) - x_0^3 \\ &= x_0^2x_3 + x_0^2x_1x_3^2 + x_0^2x_2x_4^2 + x_0x_1x_2x_3^2x_4^2 + x_0x_1x_3^3 + x_0x_2x_3x_4^2 + x_1x_2x_3^3x_4^2, \\ &x_1^2x_3^2 + x_0x_1, \\ &x_2^2x_4^2 + x_0x_2. \end{aligned}$$

Acknowledgments. The author is grateful to Naoki Terai for drawing the author's attention to this problem. The author also thanks to Ken-ichi Yoshida for giving her valuable suggestions.

This research was supported by JST, CREST.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Barile, *On the number of equations defining certain varieties*, Manuscripta Math. **91** (1996), 483–494.

[2] M. Barile, *Arithmetical ranks of Stanley–Reisner ideals via linear algebra*, Comm. Algebra **36** (2008), 4540–4556.

[3] M. Barile, *On the arithmetical rank of the edge ideals of forests*, Comm. Algebra **36** (2008), 4678–4703.

[4] M. Barile, *A note on the edge ideals of Ferrers graphs*, preprint, math.AC/0606353.

[5] M. Barile and N. Terai, *Arithmetical ranks of Stanley–Reisner ideals of simplicial complexes with a cone*, to appear in Comm. Algebra, arXiv:0809.2194.

[6] M. Barile and N. Terai, *The Stanley–Reisner ideals of polygons as set-theoretic complete intersections*, preprint, arXiv:0909.1900.

[7] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, Cohen–Macaulay rings, revised ed., Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[8] A. Corso and U. Nagel, *Monomial and toric ideals associated to Ferrers graphs*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **361** (2009), 1371–1395.

[9] J. A. Eagon and V. Reiner, *Resolutions of Stanley–Reisner rings and Alexander duality*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **130** (1998), 265–275.

[10] V. Ene, O. Olteanu and N. Terai, *Arithmetical rank of lexsegment edge ideals*, preprint, arXiv:0911.2884.

[11] K. Kimura, N. Terai and K. Yoshida, *Arithmetical rank of squarefree monomial ideals of small arithmetic degree*, J. Algebraic Combin. **29** (2009), 389–404.

[12] K. Kimura, N. Terai and K. Yoshida, *Arithmetical rank of squarefree monomial ideals of deviation two*, in Combinatorial Aspects of Commutative Algebra (V. Ene and E. Miller eds.), Contemporary Mathematics, AMS, **502** (2009), 73–112.

[13] M. Kummini, *Regularity, depth and arithmetic rank of bipartite edge ideals*, preprint, arXiv:0902.0437.

[14] G. Lyubeznik, *On the local cohomology modules* $H^i_{\mathfrak{a}}(R)$ *for ideals* $\mathfrak{a}$ *generated by monomials in an* R*-sequence*, in Complete Intersections, Acireale, 1983 (S. Greco and R. Strano eds.), Lecture Notes in Mathematics No. 1092, Springer-Verlag, 1984, pp. 214–220.

[15] M. Morales, *Simplicial ideals,* 2*-linear ideals and arithmetical rank*, preprint, math.AC/0702668.

[16] T. Schmitt and W. Vogel, *Note on set-theoretic intersections of subvarieties of projective space*, Math. Ann. **245** (1979), 247–253.

[17] N. Terai, *Alexander duality in Stanley–Reisner rings*, in Affine Algebraic Geometry, in honor of Professor Masayoshi Miyanishi on the Occasion of His Retirement from Osaka University (T. Hibi ed.), pp. 449–462, 2007, Osaka University Press.

[18] Z. Yan, *An étale analog of the Goresky-Macpherson formula for subspace arrangements*, J. Pure Appl. Algebra **146** (2000), 305–318.

Department of Pure and Applied Mathematics, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, Osaka University, Toyonaka, Osaka 560-0043, Japan

E-mail address: `kimura@math.sci.osaka-u.ac.jp`